

Attorney Docket No. FR 000129

IN THE DRAWING

Please replace FIGs 1-3 with the enclosed replacement FIGs 1-3.

Attorney Docket No. FR 000129

REMARKS

The drawings have been replaced. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-8 remain pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that based on the above amendments and the following remarks that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the attached oath/declaration to address the correction indicated on the 1/23/06 Office Action. The signature of the inventor is supplied in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a).

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the attached replacement sheets for Figs. 1-3 to address the corrections indicated on the 1/23/06 Office Action. The numbered subcomponents include labels on the figures and are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). The support for the labels is found throughout the originally filed specification.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,425,129 (Sciammarella) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0251822 (Knowles). (See 1/23/06 Office Action, p. 3, ll. 12-13).

Sciammarella is directed to displaying channel information for a user by adjusting the amount of information according to the rate with which the user previews channels. For example, more information is displayed when the previewing is slow and less information is displayed when the previewing is fast. (See Sciammarella, abstract). A decoded signal decoded by a video decoder is provided to a graphics processing module that converts the signal to the format required for a display. (See Id., col. 3, ll. 53-58). A graphics processing module may also grab still frames for currently tuned channels by first storing them in the EPG/Graphics memory and later displaying the still frames along with the video for a subsequently previewed channel. (See Id., col. 4, ll. 3-11).

Knowles is directed to a multiple interactive program guide (IPG) system providing different television programming and different IPGs to several different users respectively. A

Attorney Docket No. FR 000129

first IPG being viewed by a first user can display data added or modified via a second IPG by a second user of the system. (See Knowles, abstract). As digital data streams are received, a depacketizer depacketizes the streams resulting in audio, video, and auxiliary data streams. A decoder then decodes the streams where an extractor extracts IPG data and stores it in a memory. (See Id., p. 4, ¶ 78).

Claim 1 recites “a method of composing an MPEG-4 video scene content...characterized in that said method also comprises a second decoding step...[and] a video object creation step for generating a second set of *video* objects...said second set of video objects being rendered jointly with said first set of decoded MPEG-4 video objects during said rendering step.” The Examiner asserts that Sciammarella discloses this recitation of claim 1. (See 1/23/06 Office Action, p. 3, ll. 20-24). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Sciammarella discloses displaying *still* frames along with the video for a subsequently previewed channel. (See Sciammarella, col. 4, ll. 6-8). That is, displaying still frames with a video as taught by Sciammarella is different from the claimed displaying a video with a video. The difference would be apparent to one of ordinary skill because still frames are fixed, instantaneous moments in a video feed whereas a video is a sequence of consecutive frames in a video feed.

Furthermore, the Examiner has correctly stated that Sciammarella does not disclose “a second decoding step for generating a set of decoded video data from a second set of input video data not MPEG-4 compliant,” as recited in claim 1. (See 1/23/06 Office Action, p. 3, l. 25 – p. 4, l. 1). The Examiner has attempted to cure this deficiency with Knowles. However, Knowles does not cure this deficiency.

Knowles simply takes digital data streams as they enter the system and decodes them, depending on the order at which they are received. (See Knowles, p. 4, ¶ 78). That is, Knowles does not disclose a *second* decoding step for the generation of a second set of video objects. Knowles only discloses a single decoding step using the single decoder 3 shown in Fig. 1b. There is no teaching or suggestion in either Sciammarella or Knowles that the output of the decoders disclosed in these references could or should be combined so that they are rendered jointly. Claim 1 specifically recites the “second set of video objects being rendered jointly with

Attorney Docket No. FR 000129

said first set of decoded MPEG-4 video objects during said rendering step.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not sufficient to find two different types of decoders in the prior art, but there must be some suggestion to combine the outputs for joint rendering as recited in claim 1. There is no such suggestion in either Sciammarella or Knowles.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither Sciammarella nor Knowles, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest “a method...compris[ing] a second decoding step for generating a set of decoded video data from a second set of input video data not MPEG-4 compliant” and “said second set of video objects being rendered jointly with said first set of decoded MPEG-4 video objects during said rendering step,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1. Because claim 3 depends from and, therefore, includes all the limitations of claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Independent claim 4 recites “a second decoding means for generating a set of decoded video data from a second set of input video data not MPEG-4 compliant” and “said second set of video objects being rendered jointly with said first set of decoded MPEG-4 video objects by said rendering means.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 1, and the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for this claim. Because claims 5-7 depend from and, therefore, include all the limitations of claim 4, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Independent claim 8 recites “a computer program product...[that] comprises a set of instructions which, when loaded into said device, causes said device to carry out the method as claimed in claim 1.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 1 as the computer program product executes the instructions that correspond to the method in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for this claim.

Attorney Docket No. FR 000129

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,425,129 (Sciammarella) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0251822 (Knowles) further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0193337 (Noguchi). (See 1/23/06 Office Action, p. 5, ll. 19-21).

Noguchi is directed to a method and apparatus for adjusting font size in an electronic program guide display. A multiple channel broadcasting system generates an electronic program guide identifying channels and corresponding programs in a broadcasting system where the broadcast system determines a number of characters to be displayed in an area of an electronic program guide. (See Noguchi, abstract).

The Examiner has correctly stated that Sciammarella and Knowles jointly do not disclose a transparency coefficient. (See 1/23/06 Office Action, p. 5, l. 22 – p. 6, l. 2). The Examiner has attempted to cure this deficiency with Noguchi. However, Noguchi does not cure the deficiencies of Sciammarella and Knowles as described above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither Sciammarella nor Knowles nor Noguchi, either alone or in combination, does not disclose “a second decoding step for generating a set of decoded video data from a second set of input video data not MPEG-4 compliant, [and] a video object creation step for generating a second set of video objects, said second set of video objects being rendered jointly with said first set of decoded MPEG-4 video objects during said rendering step,” as recited in claim 1. Because claim 2 depends from and, therefore, includes all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Attorney Docket No. FR 000129

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk
Senior IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9602
Fax: (914) 332-0615
Email: larry.liberchuk@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 19, 2006

By: 

Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,539)